



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pans under the refrigerator, and admitted no other person, the saloon was not closed within the meaning of the statute.

This would seem to be following the general rule, though perhaps unfair on its face. The offense which the statute contemplates is the keeping open of a saloon on the Sabbath day. The object of the legislature was to remove all temptations from idle and dissolute persons who might be disposed to congregate at such places, and violate the Sabbath by any improper conduct. The law presumes an injury to the public by keeping open the doors of a saloon on the Sabbath day, or why prohibit it? The offense is complete under the law when it is established that the defendant has kept open a saloon on that day, without further proof of injury to individuals or the neighborhood. *Hall v. State*, 3 Ga. (Kelly) 18. A tipling house may be kept open night or day during the week, but on the Sabbath day the law says that it must be closed, absolutely closed, the front, sides and rear. It makes no difference as to whether any liquors be sold or not, the offense consists in its being open, not in selling or offering to sell, or giving it away. *Harvey v. Harvey*, 65 Ga. 568. Some states, however, look more to the spirit of the law, and it has been held that merely keeping open the doors of a tipling-house on Sunday is not an offense within the statute, forbidding such house to be kept open on Sunday, *Potter v. City of Centralia*, 47 Ill. 370. And see, *Krorer v. People*, 78 Ill. 284; *Koop v. The People*, 47 Ill. 327. In *State v. Gregory*, 47 Conn. 276, a charge that "if the room was ordinarily used for any other purpose of business, no matter what, it must be closed between those hours" (twelve o'clock Saturday night to twelve o'clock on Sunday night) no matter what other ordinary business it might be desired to carry on there, was held clearly contrary to the spirit of the law, and therefore erroneous.

LIBEL—WORDS LIBELOUS PER SE.—NEW YORK BUREAU OF INFORMATION *V. RIDGWAY-THAYER CO., ET AL.*, 104 N. Y. SUPP. 202. An article, entitled "Bucket Shop Sharks," reading: "One of M.'s most intimate friends and active lieutenants is K., founder of the New York Bureau of Information, now managed by his brother, K. K. is a tout, sleek enough in his methods to have corralled bankers and brokers of unimpeachable legitimacy as clients for the New York Bureau of Information. His portrait, until it was surreptitiously removed, was No. 295-G, in the Chicago Rogues' Gallery, and he has the distinction of having served a penal sentence for the larceny of goods from such masters of merchantry as Levi Z. Leiter and Marshall Field"—was libelous per se as to the New York Bureau of Information, whether the statements in regard to K. referred to the founder of the bureau or to his brother. *Ingraham and Scott, JJ., dissenting.*

MASTER AND SERVANT—FELLOW SERVANTS.—*PAYNE V. GEORGETOWN LUMBER CO.*, 42 So. 475 (LA.).—*Held*, that employees in a saw-mill who are not co-associated in the same work are not fellow servants.

This decision reaffirms *Merritt v. Victoria Lumber Co.*, 111 La. 159, but is contrary to the general rule as to who are fellow servants; *i. e.*, all serving a common master and engaged in the same general business, although in different departments. *Cooley on Torts* [3rd Ed.], 1071. In England the rule extends to every member of an establishment. *Abraham v. Reynolds*, 5 H. & N. 143. In Massachusetts, *Shaw, C. J.*, early held that an engineer could not recover for an injury in consequence of the negligence of a switch-